UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,802	04/12/2001	Venugopal P. Reddy	020431.0832	8684

7590 08/24/2004	EXAMINER
Christopher W. Kennerly, Esq.	CHANG, SUNRAY
Baker Botts L.L.P.	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

Christopher W. Kennerly, Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, 6th Floor
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/834,802	REDDY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sunray Chang	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 April 2001*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 April 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1.   Regarding claims 1, 12 – 15, 20 and 26 – 28 are rejected under 35USC *§ 112*

second paragraph.

2,   As to claims 1, 12 – 15, and 26 - 28, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this

limitation in the claim. For example, applicants recite the limitation "it" of claim 1 [line

7] is not previously cited.

The term "it" has been interpreted as "server object" hereinafter.

3.   As to claim 15, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim. For example, applicants recite the limitation "client computer" of claim 15 [line 7,

Page 25] is not previously cited.

The term "client computer" has been interpreted as "client component"

hereinafter.

4.   As to claim 20, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim. For example, applicants recite the limitation "the server component is within a first

container and the client component is within a second container remote from the first

container" of claim 20 [line 1 – 3] is not previously cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.   Claims 1 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Graham W. Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,128, and referred to as Glass hereinafter).

6.   **Regarding independent claim 1,**

Glass teaches,

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] operable to access data associated with one or more of the server objects [Col. 5, Line 36 – 37].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

7.   **Regarding dependent claim 2,**

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

8.   **Regarding dependent claim 3,**

- Both local and remote client components are operable to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

9.   **Regarding dependent claim 4,**

- Client component is coded as if it will always be remote from associated server components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

- All communications between client component and a server component will be remote [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

10.   **Regarding dependent claim 5,**

- All client components of the server component have been developed using templatized code [Col. 6, Line 59 – 61 and 64 – 67].

- Local and remote client-server interface transparency is preserved across all such client components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 34].

- Repetitive code generation has been minimized in developing such client components [Col. 6, Line 54 – 59].

11.   **Regarding dependent claim 6,**

- Server component [18, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [Fig. 1].

- In second container [14, Fig. 1], a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 7,**

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2].

13.   **Regarding dependent claim 8,**

- Proxy component performs management tasks to the proxy component [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

14.   **Regarding dependent claim 9,**

- Proxy component customized by a developer of the server component [Col. 6, Line 17 – 19].

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 10,**

- Proxy component and server component cooperate to reconcile proxy object data with server object data consistently with local and remote client-server interface transparency [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20 and 33 – 34].

16.   **Regarding independent claim 11,**

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] operable to access data associated with one or more of the server objects [Col. 5, Line 36 – 37].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

17.   **Regarding independent claim 12,**

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] in first container [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [20, Fig. 1], in a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [12, Fig. 1], distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1].

- The client component can access server objects data [Col. 6, Line 14] without been predetermined local or remote [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

18.   **Regarding independent claim 13,**

- A client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] with server object data [19, Fig.1].

- The client component can access server objects data [Col. 6, Line 14].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

19.   **Regarding independent claim 14,**

- There is a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] and a client component [20, Fig. 1] in the first container [14, Fig. 1] remote to second container [12, Fig. 1].

- Second container [12, Fig. 1] containing a server component [18, Fig. 1] supports server objects data [19, Fig. 1].

- The client component is distributed from the server component [Fig. 1].

- A proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- Server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

20.   **Regarding independent claim 15,**

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 –20].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

21.   **Regarding dependent claim 16,**

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

22.   **Regarding dependent claim 17,**

- Both local and remote client components are operable to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

23. **Regarding dependent claim 18,**

- Client component is coded as if it will always be remote from associated server

  components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

- All communications between client component and a server component will be

  remote [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

24. **Regarding dependent claim 19,**

- All client components of the server component have been developed using

  templatized code [Col. 6, Line 59 – 61 and 64 – 67].

- Local and remote client-server interface transparency is preserved across all such

  client components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 34].

- Repetitive code generation has been minimized in developing such client

  components [Col. 6, Line 54 – 59].

25. **Regarding dependent claim 20,**

- Server component [18, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote

  from the first container [Fig. 1].

- In second container [14, Fig. 1], a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy

  objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data

  [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line

  14].

26. **Regarding dependent claim 21,**

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2].

27. **Regarding dependent claim 22,**

- Proxy component performs management tasks to the proxy component [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

28. **Regarding dependent claim 23,**

- Proxy component customized by a developer of the server component [Col. 6, Line 17 – 19].

29. **Regarding dependent claim 24,**

- Proxy component and server component cooperate to reconcile proxy object data with server object data consistently with local and remote client-server interface transparency [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20 and 33 – 34].

30. **Regarding independent claim 25,**

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 –20].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

31.   **Regarding independent claim 26,**

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Server component [18, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [Fig. 1].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 –20].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Both local and remote client components use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

32.   **Regarding independent claim 27,**

- A scheme makes the server object substantially transparent to the remote or local client component, while client component accessing remote server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 32].

33.   **Regarding independent claim 28,**

- There is a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] and a client component [20, Fig. 1] in the first container [14, Fig. 1] remote to second container [12, Fig. 1].

- Second container [12, Fig. 1] containing a server component [18, Fig. 1] supports server objects data [19, Fig. 1].

- a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

Conclusion

34.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,049) discloses a

midware, software systems, a software management system, clients, subclients,

transparent. Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,805) discloses a midware,

software systems, a software management system, clients, subclients,

transparent. Zinky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,691,148) discloses a network switch,

a ORB proxy, a central resource utilization controller.

35.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang whose telephone number is

703-305-8744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (703)308-3179.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the

status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist

whose telephone number is 703-746-3506.

Sunray Chang
Patent Examiner   Anthony Knight
Group Art Unit 2121   Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100   Group 3600
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

August 22, 2004